

symbols each sequence of one or more symbols representing one of the sequences of one or more words;

(c) a display screen including a working region with a periphery, the display screen capable of displaying a plurality of selectable regions adjacent the periphery of the working region, each of the selectable regions selectable by the user, each of the selectable regions associated respectively with and simultaneously displaying on the display screen one of the sequences of one or more words or symbols; and

(d) control means for:

(1) receiving a movement related signal indicating a location with respect to the display screen responsive to user movement by a user, the user movement indicating a potential user selection;

(2) in response to an intersection of the location and a particular one of the selectable regions, speaking, by means of the voice output device, the sequence of one or more words associated with the particular selectable region.

172. The voice output system of claim 114 further comprising:

(a) a computer system including the display screen and the movement related signal receiver; and

(b) a program, executable on the computer system;

and wherein each of the delimit device and the selection device is formed by the combination of the program and the computer system.

II. REMARKS

The Specification is amended to clarify which objects are achieved by which aspects of the invention.

The terms "display screen", "movement related signal receiver", etc. listed in the amendments to the Specification have been added to the claims by various amendments and were not present in the Specification as originally filed. These amendments to the Specification insure that terms in the claims have a basis in the Specification, in accordance with MPEP §608.01(o). No new matter is added.

Several claims depending from new claim 170 are amended to refer to the selectable region to be selected as the *particular* selectable region and to refer to the menu option associated with the

particular selectable region as the *particular* menu option.

Several claims depending from new claim 170 are amended to use component language in lieu of means plus function language.

Claim 2 is amended to list body members of the operator.

Claim 8 is amended to claim selection responsive to a *ratio* of dwell times.

Claim 9 is amended to refer to a selectable region *on* the display screen as the *certain* selectable region.

Typographical errors are corrected in claims 96 and 110.

Claims 119-122 and 169 are each amended to refer not to the apparatus of the parent claim, but instead to the voice output system of the parent claim.

Claim 132 is amended to add an eye tracker to the claim's list of pointers.

New claim 170 is based on claim 1, but replaces the means plus function language of claim 1 with component language. All claim previously depending directly or indirectly from claim 1 now depend directly or indirectly from new claim 170. The means plus function language of these dependent claims is replaced with the component language found in their new parent claim 170. In addition, all claims now depending from new claim 170 are amended to use the term "display screen" in lieu of "display area", as found in claim 170.

Claims 170-172 are new.

Each of the new and amended claims reads on the elected species. No new matter is added.

The Examiner stated in our telephone interview on 15 July 1997 that each of the independent claims 1, 94, 106, and 114 as amended in Applicant Document No. 032-14 overcomes the Baker and Bronson references. Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-18, 92-93, 95-96, 99-100, 107-108, and 111 each depend directly or indirectly from one of the listed independent claims or from new claim 170, each further limits its respective parent claim, and each was withdrawn from consideration by either Examiner Weldon or Examiner Liang. Applicant requests that the Examiner reinstate and allow these dependent claims. Claims 6, 90, 98, 109-110, 113, 115-133, and 169 each depend directly or indirectly from one of the listed independent claims or from new claim 170, each further limits its respective parent claim, and each was rejected by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicant requests that the Examiner allow these dependent claims and each of the listed independent claims.

At the close of the 15 July 1997 telephone interview and again in a telephone conversation on 1 October 1997, the Examiner refused to schedule an appointment with Applicant to further discuss the merits of the case. Consequently, Applicant has no indication of whether, in the Examiner's opinion,

Bronson is pertinent to claims other than those discussed on 15 July 1997.

Favorable reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald K. Forest

Applicant

Date: 14 October 1997

209 Croydon Ave.

Rockville, MD 20850-4145

Phone (301) 251-1108

Fax (301) 251-6299